



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

Paper No. 9

THOMAS J. SCOTT, JR. ESQ.  
HUNTON & WILLIAMS  
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT  
1900 K STREET, NW, SUITE 1200  
WASHINGTON, DC 20006

COPY MAILED

FEB 03 2003

OFFICE OF PETITIONS

In re Application of	:
Robert J. Rosko et al	:DECISION DISMISSING PETITION
Application No. 09/994,725	:UNDER 37 CFR 1.137(f)
Filed: November 28, 2001	:
Attorney Docket No. 47004.000111	:

This is a decision on the petition under 37 CFR 1.137(f),<sup>1</sup> filed January 15, 2003, to revive the above-identified application.

The petition is **dismissed** as inappropriate for the reasons stated below.

The record discloses that, on November 28, 2001, the date of filing of the instant application, a Request and Certification under 35 U.S.C. § 122(b)(2)(B)(i) was filed certifying that "the invention disclosed in the attached **application has not and will not** be the subject of an application filed in another country, or under a multilateral international agreement, that requires publication at eighteen months after filing."

Petitioner now requests under 35 U.S.C. § 122(b)(2)(B)(ii) that the Request and Certification Under 35 U.S.C. § 122(b)(2)(B)(i) be rescinded and the application revived because this application became abandoned for failure to notify the Office within 45 days of the filing of a corresponding international or foreign application. In this regard, petitioner states that this application is a continuation-in-part of U.S. Application No. 09/591,687, filed June 12, 2000, which is the subject of PCT Application No. PCT/US01/40911, which was filed on June 12, 2001, which date

---

<sup>1</sup> 37 CFR 1.137(f) provides for revival of a nonprovisional application which became abandoned pursuant to the provisions of 35 U.S.C. § 122(b)(2)(B)(iii) for failure to timely notify the Office of the filing of an application in a foreign country or under a multinational treaty that requires publication of applications eighteen months after filing.

is prior to the date of filing the instant application.

The instant nonprovisional application did not become abandoned as a result of the filing of a corresponding application filed in another country, or under a multilateral international agreement, **subsequent** to the filing of the present application. In this regard, 35 U.S.C. § 122(b)(2)(B)(iii) states:

An applicant who has made a request under clause (i) but who **subsequently files, in a foreign country or under a multilateral international agreement** specified in clause (i), an application directed to the invention disclosed in the application filed in the Patent and Trademark Office, shall notify the Director of such filing not later than 45 days **after the date of the filing of such foreign or international application**. A failure of the applicant to provide such notice within the prescribed period shall result in the application being regarded as abandoned, unless it is shown to the satisfaction of the Director that the delay in submitting the notice was unintentional [emphasis supplied].

The facts of this case are that the subject application was filed on November 28, 2001, and the corresponding foreign application was filed on June 12, 2001. The statute does not provide for the situation where a certification under 35 USC 122(b)(2)(B)(i) was made, despite the fact that an application was previously filed in another country or under the multilateral international agreement. The statute at 35 USC 122(b)(2)(B)(iii) only provides for revival in the situation where a certification was made under 35 USC 122(b)(2)(B)(i) at the time of filing the application and an application was subsequently filed in a foreign country without notifying the Office within 45 days of the filing thereof.

In view of the above and since this application did not become abandoned pursuant to the provisions of 35 USC 122(b)(2)(B)(iii), a petition to revive under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.137(f) is inappropriate and must be dismissed.

As requested, the Request and Certification Under 35 U.S.C. § 122(b)(2)(B)(i) has been rescinded. A Corrected Filing Receipt indicating the projected date of publication of May 15, 2003 accompanies this decision.

The rules and statutory provisions governing the operations of the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office require payment of a fee on filing each petition. See 35 U.S.C. §

41(c)(7). Accordingly, the petition fee of \$1,300 charged to petitioner's deposit account on January 17, 2003 will not be refunded.

This application is being forwarded to Technology Center AU 3628 for examination in due course.

Any inquiries concerning this decision may be directed to the undersigned at (703) 305-8680.

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Frances Hicks".

Frances Hicks  
Petitions Examiner  
Office of Petitions  
Office of the Deputy Commissioner  
for Patent Examination Policy

ATTACHMENT: Corrected Filing Receipt